

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
NORTHERN DIVISION

LAKEEVIS T. JACKSON

PETITIONER

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:24-CV-57-KHJ-RPM

WARDEN CORNELIUS TURNER

RESPONDENT

ORDER

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Robert P. Myers, Jr.'s [24] Report and Recommendation. The [24] Report recommends that Respondent Warden Cornelius Turner's [23] Motion to Dismiss be granted and that pro se Petitioner LaKeevis T. Jackson's [9] Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be dismissed with prejudice as time-barred. [24] at 5. The Court adopts the [24] Report and dismisses Jackson's [9] Amended Petition with prejudice.

On January 30, 2024, Jackson filed this habeas action challenging his conviction—to which he had entered a guilty plea—on a charge of statutory rape. *See* Pet. [1]; Pet. Plead Guilty [23-1]. Jackson filed an [9] Amended Petition on May 9, 2024, in which he challenged his conviction based on Mississippi's speedy-trial statute, ineffective assistance of trial counsel, and a request for military conscription in lieu of confinement. *See* [9] at 5, 7–8. On December 9, 2024, Warden Turner moved to dismiss, arguing that the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996's (AEDPA) one-year limitation period bars Jackson's [9] Amended Petition. *See* [23] at 5.

The [24] Report concluded that Jackson filed his original [1] Petition 17 months after the limitation period ran on August 24, 2022, and that Jackson had not shown his entitlement to equitable tolling. *See* [24] at 3–4.<sup>1</sup>

The Court must review de novo a magistrate judge’s report only when a party objects to the report within 14 days after being served with a copy. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). But when no party timely objects to the report, the Court applies “the ‘clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law’ standard of review.” *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam).

No party has objected to the [24] Report, and the time to do so has now passed. *See* § 636(b)(1). Finding the [24] Report neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law, the Court ADOPTS the [24] Report as its opinion and DISMISSES Jackson’s [9] Amended Petition WITH PREJUDICE. In doing so, the Court has considered all the parties’ arguments. Those arguments not addressed would not have altered the Court’s decision. The Court will enter a separate final judgment consistent with this Order.

SO ORDERED, this 12th day of June, 2025.

s/ Kristi H. Johnson  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge also noted that the Court cannot grant Jackson’s request for conscription in lieu of confinement. [24] at 4. “[H]abeas is not available to review questions unrelated to the cause of detention.” *Pierre v. United States*, 525 F.2d 933, 935 (5th Cir. 1976).